



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

---

A HISTORY OF ART IN PHŒNICIA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES; from the French of Georges Perrot, Professor in the Faculty of Letters, Paris, member of the Institute, and Charles Chipiez. Illustrated with six hundred and forty-four engravings in the text and ten steel and colored plates. Translated and edited by Walter Armstrong, B. A., etc. London: Chapman and Hall, 1885. [Vol. I., pp. xv., 410; Vol. II., pp. xiv., 460].

In 1882, M. Perrot announced, in the introduction of his *History of Ancient Egyptian Art*, that, with the help of M. Chipiez, he purposed to give to the world a history of ancient art, the plan of which should have a completeness never possible until the present time. In this work the art of the Occident should be traced from its earliest beginnings down to the end of the classic time, and should be considered always as illustrating the life and civilization of the peoples among which it existed. Especially should the results of the discoveries of the last half-century in Egypt and Western Asia be brought to bear upon the development of art and higher human life in Europe. Of this great undertaking the third part has just appeared in English form. Beginning with Egypt, in the second part the author went to Chaldæa and Assyria, and now has reached Phœnicia and Cyprus. The scale of the whole work may be seen in the fact that already we have nearly three thousand pages, with two thousand cuts and plates.

M. Perrot is a thoroughly trained scholar, familiar with all the facts about ancient art as yet known to the world. Unquestionably, any sort of a comprehensive view of the facts now ascertained about Phœnician art, given by a person well acquainted with them, is of great use to scholarship, and of great interest to the cultivated public at large. The results of modern archæological research are so widely scattered, often so hard to get at, that few except pronounced specialists can hope to gather them up for themselves. M. Perrot has gathered them up, and given us a comprehensive view of them; and for this we are grateful.

Yet, as one reads the book, it is impossible to forget that it purports to be a part of a history of art; and that, to write such a history, great knowl-

edge is demanded, not only of archæology, but also of men and things; intimate acquaintance with ideas, and appreciation of their comparative value. A true history of art should have its plan drawn so as to exhibit the development and relative importance of moral ideas. A hand-book of archæology may well be arranged solely with a view to a clear and complete account of the facts: but a history of art is concerned primarily, not with the facts, but with the ideas which those facts stand for and illustrate.

Even in M. Perrot's volumes on Egypt it began to appear doubtful whether he would give us a permanently valuable treatise on ancient art. There was in many places a fluent diffuseness, an eagerness to make a parade of the facts, as mere facts, a lack of that true proportion and symmetry which can be obtained only by strict weighing of the relative value of ideas as expressed in art, which indicated that, in spite of the professions in his introduction, he had failed in comprehension of the real scope and importance of art. It must be confessed that, as the successive parts of his work have appeared, this doubt has grown almost to certainty. The volumes on Chaldæa and Assyria exhibited these same faults even more decidedly than those on Egypt; while these last two volumes entirely convince us that we are not to have from M. Perrot a history of art, but, at best, a hand-book of archæology.

The Phœnicians, so far as we know, did not bring a single important fructifying idea into the world. Nor, as the inventors of technical processes, by which moral ideas and emotions may be expressed, were they remarkable. Their most important contribution to higher civilization, the adaptation of the alphabet, was, so far as concerned themselves, quite a mechanical and unexpressive one, an accident of business. Their arts of dyeing purple, of pottery, of making glass, of carving ivory, of casting and beating metals, hardly deserve to be called arts; they were for the most part only trades. Their architecture, sculpture, painting were, if the discoveries of M. Renan and others are to be relied upon for a judgment, of the most unimaginative sort. Their religion, so far as we know it, was entirely an appeal to the senses; and the only religious idea coming from them which had a lasting effect upon subsequent Occidental civilization was that worship of Astarte which was diffused so poisonously from centres of Phœnician influence, like Corinth, through the Greek world in the time of its decline.

And yet the Phœnicians rendered the world a great, an indispensable, service. If they did not themselves enrich civilization and art, they were the intermediaries between the East and the West, the common-carriers of the ancient world; carriers, too, not only of merchandise, but indi-

rectly of ideas. In an enterprising, on the whole admirable, way they transmitted the arts of Egypt and the East to Greece and the West. It was, to be sure, chiefly the mere technical methods of the arts which they transmitted, but this was much; nor are there wanting evidences of a transmission of actual forms of expression. Especially by their metal-lurgy the Phœnicians seem to have awakened the interest of the Greeks, and to have influenced powerfully the development of the Greek plastic arts.

It is indeed true that a nation which has had so important a place in history may not be lightly passed over. It is true, as M. Perrot says, that "the historian must show himself cool and impartial, and must bring into the light the real services rendered to humanity even by the most unlovable race." But it is none the less true that, if one were to write a history of art in which strict proportion should be regarded, it would be absurd to give to the Phœnicians just as much space as to the Egyptians, among whom there were the most remarkable and original inventions of technical processes, a quite noteworthy feeling for moral ideas, and at times an extraordinary imaginative power; or again, as much space as to the Chaldæans and Assyrians, whose fecundity was indeed far less than that of the Egyptians, but who had at least something of what Goethe has called "an original foundation to rest on, and the ability to develop out of oneself the requirements of the good and beautiful." M. Perrot shows his disregard of proportion in that he has done this very thing, given, with but trifling differences, the same space respectively to Egypt, to Chaldæa and Assyria, and to Phœnicia. When the author reaches Greece, this lack of proportion must become even more marked, displaying itself, however, in an opposite direction; for, even if he should give us ten volumes about Greece, they would not suffice to treat the art of that country with a fulness which should correspond to its comparative importance in the history of ancient art.

No, let us repeat; we must not regard the work of MM. Perrot and Chipiez as a history of ancient art either final, or adequate to our present knowledge: we must regard it as a hand-book of archæology. Furthermore, even from this point of view, these last volumes have very serious defects. The first defect is the lack of scientific conciseness. The fluent introductions and historical chapters might better be reduced to a statement of the facts, apart from speculation. It were well had there been throughout the book less effort at style, more attempt to give ascertained results unembellished, as well as to present difficulties fairly. In short, we cannot help thinking that there should be more of that German dryness, which is the only proper method for books purely scientific.

The numerous or partial repetitions, both of ideas and of facts, which come from the attempt to use material both historically and archæologically are wearisome, and do much to render the book confused and its substance difficult to remember. A scientific work should be constructed upon the hardest and stiffest possible lines, such as the mind can easily follow and retain. In certain purely archæological chapters of M. Perrot's book, such as those upon civil architecture, glass, and metallurgy, we find these lines; but in more important chapters, *e. g.*, those on forms, sculpture, ceramics, gems, we do not find them. A person reading these latter chapters will hardly obtain a distinct conception of the extent and character of Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Greek influences upon Phœnician art.

If, at times, there is too much repetition and detail, at other times there are passed over lightly, as though settled, matters which cannot be so considered, but deserve fuller treatment. For example, regarding the volute, that Oriental form which finally played so great a part in Greek architecture, and interesting examples of which were found in Cyprus, M. Perrot says that it was a form suggested by the action of metal beaten under the hammer (Vol. I., p. 12). This may be so; but M. Perrot seems to have no right to pass unnoticed the suggestion of Reber, and others, that the volute is a conventionalized form of a calyx, with curling sepals (*cf.* Reber, *Hist. of Anc. Art*, trans. by Clarke, p. 20), nor the still older theory, which has much to be said in its favor, and which he, himself, in his history of Assyrian art (Vol. I., p. 209), could hardly help assenting to, that the volute was derived from the form of a curling ram's horn. Certainly, this is a most useful and interesting enquiry in archæology, and demands a somewhat elaborate comparison of opinion and synthesis of facts.

The relation between Phœnicia and Greece seems to us a matter deserving fuller attention and more careful treatment than M. Perrot has given it. Of positive effect of Phœnicia on Greece we hear almost nothing; curiously enough, less than of the effect of Greece on Phœnicia, although the former is a vital question and the latter of interest only to scholars. Perhaps M. Perrot means to dwell upon this at greater length in the volumes on the art of Greece. But it would certainly be a great improvement to his book on Phœnicia, if one could find there something to indicate his view of the probabilities with regard to the earlier relation between these two countries. For example, we should like to have some account made of possible Egyptian and Oriental influences, passing through Phœnicia and Cyprus, and affecting the development of Doric architecture. This question is one of the most interesting still awaiting

investigation and decision by archæologists; and a book on Phœnician archæology which says nothing about it, is certainly not to be regarded as complete.

It is pleasant, after so much blame, to be able to praise the care with which the Phœnician remains of Malta, Gozo, and Sardinia have been used by M. Perrot; few persons have known or could learn much of these, since the sources of information are almost inaccessible; while the extent of Phœnician influence in the Mediterranean at an early date is hardly anywhere more admirably illustrated.

But it must be confessed that these volumes do not make, on the whole, a favorable impression from any point of view. The fact has to be acknowledged, that the art of the Phœnicians is without value in itself. The Phœnicians were a people without refined intelligence, lacking imagination, coarse with the coarseness of thorough sensuality; their art was consequently, in general, brutal, and it must always be difficult for a book about their art to avoid having characteristics of its theme. M. Perrot, we are compelled to say, has not avoided the coarseness of his subject. We cannot illustrate this better than by quoting a passage in which he is eloquent about a series of obscene statuettes of Astarte:—"Between the oldest images of the Oriental goddess, some naïvely shameless in their nudity, others crushed under a heavy harness of robes and jewelry, and the masterpiece of Praxiteles, there is all the patient invention, all the ardor and ceaseless ambition of the Greek genius; and yet the chain is never broken. The path we have laid down will lead us to the feet of the Medici Venus and the Venus of the Capitol; and when we bend almost in worship before those deathless marbles, our minds will turn to the rude figures of stone and clay picked up on the sites where the first Greeks learned to adore Astarte the Syrian." Surely, there can be no doubt of the insufficiency of a man who talks thus to deal with moral ideas. It is with no pleasant anticipations that we await what M. Perrot shall have to say about Greek art.

The English edition of this work is of handsome appearance, and Mr. Armstrong's translation for the most part runs smoothly. He is not, however, always careful, and a severe critic will pretty frequently be made uncomfortable. Such uses of words as 'cap' for 'capital' are certainly not English; and the frequent use of *provenance* for 'source' is really distressing. The proof-reading has not always been accurate; and we have noticed a tolerably large number of incorrect references to illustrations, always vexatious to the reader. The illustrations (and this applies, as well, to the French edition) are of great assistance in following the text, but, as pictures, are very poor, comparing unfavorably with

those in Renan's *Phénicie*, or Cesnola's *Cyprus*. The maps are carelessly altered from the French maps, a few names being rudely changed, the rest left in the original. The volumes lack that fine carefulness which such books should always show, and have too much the appearance of being got up hastily and cheaply so as to pass for *Pracht-bände*.

ARTHUR RICHMOND MARSH.

ALTROJANISCHE GRAEBER UND SCHAEDEL. Von Rudolf Virchow. Mit 13 Tafeln. Aus den Abhandlungen der Koenigl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1882.

UEBER ALTE SCHAEDEL VON ASSOS UND CYPERN. Von Rudolf Virchow. Mit 5 Tafeln. Aus den Abhandlungen der Koenigl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin vom Jahre 1884.

#### TROJAN AND ASSIAN CRANIOLOGY.

In the first of these works Dr. Virchow has published all the remains of human beings which were preserved from the excavations of Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik, and of Mr. Calvert at Hanaï-Tepeh. In the second, he renders a similar service to anthropological and ethnographical science by giving the results of his minute investigations concerning three skulls from Assos, discovered during the excavations of the Archæological Institute of America upon that site. The subjects of these researches are of unique interest, and the light thrown by them upon various problems of primitive history is new and most suggestive.

The earlier volume deals particularly with skulls and bones from Troy, Thymbra, Ophryinion, and an ancient site near Chamligia. It gives also a complete review of Calvert's digging at the mound of Hanaï-Tepeh, (Thymbra), illustrated by the first colored plates which have been devoted to these important antiquities. To this is added a disquisition concerning the site of Ophryinion, identified by Calvert in the immediate vicinity of Ren-Kieui, where a great ridge overhangs, like a "brow," the ravine of the Megaloremma,—familiar to all travellers between the town of the Dardanelles and the Trojan plain. An account, by Virchow, of fifteen crania from this place was published in the twelfth volume of the *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1879).

The oldest of the four skulls from Troy was found, in 1872, at a depth of 13 m., in the stratum now designated by Schliemann as the remains of the "second" city. It is the head of a young girl who appears to have perished during the burning of that ancient settlement, for the skeleton